



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,187	01/31/2001	John Steven Langford	AUS920000943US1	4502
7:	590 07/02/2004		EXAMINER DADA, BEEMNET W	
Robert H. Fra				
P.O. Box 23324 Oklahoma City, OK 73123-2334			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2135	5
			DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004	>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

f

•		1				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/773,187	LANGFORD ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Beemnet W Dada	2135				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 Ja	nuary 2001.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
2)		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2135

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

- 3. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Crosbie, Mark (US Provisional Application 60,210,922).
- 4. As per claims 1, 6 and 11, Crosbie teaches a method for detecting possible security violations and issues in a computer system related to user ID substituting and switching (i.e., 'SU' ing), said computer system having a log of user ID substitutions and switches, said method comprising the steps of:

providing a set of rules which define conditions of user ID substitutions and switches which are to be considered possible security issues (i.e., repeated number of SU attempts within a certain period of time) [page 30, section: '1. N failed su pattern'];

Page 2

Art Unit: 2135

providing a process adapted to evaluate said log of user ID substitutions and switches according to said set of rules (i.e., monitoring and analyzing su log information to detect security violations) [page 30, section: '1. N failed su pattern' and pages 13-14, section '1. The IDS Engine'];

Page 3

evaluating said log of user ID substitutions and switches to find any entries in said log which meet one or more defined conditions in said set of rules (i.e., monitoring and analyzing su log information to detect security violations) [page 30, section: '1. N failed su pattern' and pages 13-14, section '1. The IDS Engine']; and

outputting an alert responsive to finding one or more log entries which meet said conditions [page 13 last and page 14 first line].

- 5. As per claims 4, 9 and 15, Crosbie teaches the method as applied above. Furthermore, Crosbie teaches, the method, wherein said step of evaluating said log of user ID substitutions and switches comprises evaluating a SULOG file in a system having a UNIX-like operating system (i.e. HP-UX system) [page 9, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs].
- 6. As per claims 5, 10, 16, Crosbie teaches the method as applied above. Furthermore, Crosbie teaches, the method, wherein said step of outputting an alert comprises sending an electronic message to a predetermined destination address (i.e., sending an alert to a central administrative console) [page 13 last and page 14 first line and page 16 1st paragraph].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2135

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 4

- 8. Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crosbie, Mark (US Provisional Application 60,210,922) in view of Rowland, Craig H (Ref. U).
- 9. As per claims 2, 3, 7, 8, and 12-14 Crosbie teaches evaluating log of user ID substitutions and switches to find any entries in said log which meet one or more defined conditions in said set of rules (i.e., monitoring and analyzing su log information to detect security violations) [page 30, section: '1. N failed su pattern' and pages 13-14, section '1. The IDS Engine'], in a UNIX-like operating system (i.e. HP-UX system) [page 9, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs]. Furthermore, Crosbie suggests using a daemon to process su log file [page 30 last line].

Crosbie does not explicitly teach evaluating a log by periodically executing a CRON daemon. Rowland teaches a method of detecting security violations comprising evaluating a log by periodically executing a CRON daemon [page 2, 5th paragraph]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to evaluate a system log by periodically executing a CRON daemon as per teachings of Rowland and include it into the log monitoring and evaluation method taught by Crosbie, in order to alert violations frequently.

Art Unit: 2135

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. PTO Form 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Beemnet W Dada whose telephone number is (703) 305-8895. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:30 am - 6:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Beemnet Dada

June 17, 2004

JUST 8-

Page 5